DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 185 477 CG 014 374

AUTHOR Kahnweiler, William M.; Tollin, Stephen A.
TITLE Using Social Influence Variables to Evaluate Counselor Trainees: An Applied Study.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Personnel and Guidance Association (Atlanta, GA, March 26-29, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Students; *Counselor Client Relationship; Counselor Educators; *Counselor Evaluation; *Counselor Training; Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; *Interpersonal Attraction; Interviews; *Practicums; Rating Scales; Research Projects; Supervision
IDENTIFIERS *Counseling Evaluation Inventory; *Counselor Rating Form

ABSTRACT

The Counselor Rating Form (CRF) and Counseling Evaluation Inventory (CEI) were used in an applied setting to evaluate counselor interns. A sample of 17 counselor trainees conducted two interviews with two internship. After each interview, the trainees rated themselves on the CRF and the clients rated the trainees on both the CRF and CEI. Supervisors rated the trainees on the CRF after viewing videotapes of the counseling sessions with the confederates. Supervisors had previously rated them during trainees' prepracticum course. Results indicated that: (1) supervisor ratings did not increase significantly from prepracticum to internship; (2) there was no significant agreement among client, trainee and supervisor ratings; and (3) there was a significant positive correlation between client CRF and CEI scores. The concurrent validity of the CRF was supported, and holds much promise as a tool in counselor training. However, further research is needed before adapting the CRF as an evaluative instrument. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED185477

Using Social Influence Variables To Evaluate Counselor Trainees: An Applied Study

William M. Kahnweiler

Miami University

Stephen A. Rollin

Florida State University

CG 014374

The senior author may be contacted at Miami University, Department of Personnel and Guidance, 401 McGuffey Hall, Oxford, Ohio 45056. Phone: (513) 529-4333.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William Kahnweiler

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Using Social Influence Variables to Evaluate Counselor Trainees: An Applied Study

Counselor educators are often confronted with the complex task of evaluating counselor trainee performance. The difficulties inherent in this facet of counselor training have beeen widely recognized (Moore, 1977; Seaman & Wurtz, 1968; Tinsley & Tinsley, 1977; Whiteley, 1969). Though most counselor educators agree that some form of trainee evaluation is necessary (Moore, 1977), there has been much controversy over what (Mahon & Altmann, 1977), how (Gormally & Hill, 1974) and when to evaluate trainees (Butler & Hansen, 1973; Resnikoff, 1972). In addition, the question of who should evaluate trainees has received considerable attention (Garfield, Prager, & Bergin, 1971; Kiesler, 1966; Matarazzo, 1971; Thoresen, 1969). These questions are far from being resolved, and consequently there exists a need to develop and research new methods of evaluating counselor trainee performance. This need stems from both the shortcomings of current measurement technology (Brammer, 1977) and demands for accountability in counseling and counselor training (Atkinson & Zimmer, 1977; Canada & Lynch, 1975; Sweeney, 1979).

Social influence variables represent a potentially fruitful area upon which to evaluate counselor trainee performance. The study of these variables originated in social psychology (Hovland, Janis, & Kelly, 1953; Hovland & Weiss, 1951; Kelly, 1967; Schopler, 1965) and subsequently received attention in counseling psychology (Dell, 1973; Schmidt & Strong,

1971; Strong, 1968, 1970; Strong & Dixon, 1971). This perspective conceptualizes counseling as a process of interpersonal influence. It presumes that the manner in which counselors are perceived will affect their ability to influence clients in constructive ways. The counselor qualities of perceived expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness have been suggested as factors associated with counselors' influence power (Strong, 1968; Dell, 1973).

Recently, much research has examined the role of counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness in the counseling process and counseling effectiveness. Perceived counselor expertness was associated with positive therapeutic outcomes in several studies (Dell & Schmidt, 1976; Kennedy, 1976; Slane, 1977; Spiegel, 1976). Other research demonstrated a relationship between perceived counselor attractiveness and clients' willingness to be influenced (Patton, 1969; Strong & Dixon, 1971). It appears then that perceived counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness do contribute positively to the counseling process and outcome. It also suggests that such variables might be used as a basis for evaluating counselor performance.

Despite the fact that much theoretical and empirical work has been devoted to social influence variables in counseling, there has been a dearth of research investigating these variables in counselor training settings. A study by Barak and LaCrosse (1977) indicated that trainees, clients, and supervisors perceived trainee behavior using the Counselor Rating Form from significantly different perspectives. The present investigation was designed to demonstrate the use of this instrument (CRF) in evaluating the performance of counselor trainees. Three distinct aspects of the study are discussed below.

The appraisal of counselor trainee behavior is a subjective process (Barak & LaCrosse, 1977). It follows that there may be differential perceptions of a trainee's behavior among several key observers. Typically, there are three persons who serve as observers of a trainee's counseling efforts. These are the client, the trainee, and the supervisor. In order to evaluate a trainee effectively, it becomes necessary to compare the perceptions of these three sources (Kiesler, 1966; Matarazzo, 1971). This study compared perceptions of counselor trainee behavior among clients, counselor trainees, and supervisors. The Counselor Rating Form (CRF) was used to compare these perceptions.

This study also compared the levels of trainee social influence variables at the prepracticum and internship stages of a training program. There is a paucity of studies which have investigated the effects of early training experiences on subsequent counseling performance (Spooner & Stone, 1977). The need for follow-up research in the training of helping professionals becomes more apparent in light of studies which revealed a decrease in trainees' level of functioning over time (Bath & Calhoun, 1977; Carkhuff, 1968; Collingwood, 1971; Guttman & Haase, 1972; Haase, DiMattia, & Guttman, 1972; McCarthy, Danish, & D'Augelli, 1977; Spooner & Stone, 1977). The present investigation assessed trainees' level of social influence variables from a longitudinal perspective.

The third aspect of this study examined the concurrent validity of the CRF. To date, only one previous study (LaCrosse, 1977) attempted to correlate scores on the CRF with an established measure of counseling effectiveness. The present study compared client ratings on the CRF with a client satisfaction index. It was thought that this procedure would lend support to the concurrent validity of the CRF. In addition, if the social influence

variables correlated highly with client satisfaction, then the former could be considered part of a common evaluation process.

Method

Subjects

Trainees. Seventeen advanced master's-level counselor trainees from a large, southeastern university participated in this study. There were 4 males and 13 females, ages 22 to 29. Each trainee was working in an internship when the study was conducted. These internships were in a variety of educational and mental health settings. The amount of counseling experience each subject had prior to their internship was roughly equivalent.

Clients. Two semiprofessional actors, one male and one female, served as coached clients. There appears to be ample precedence for the use of coached clients in the evaluation of counselor trainee performance (Heller, Myers & Kline, 1963; Kelz, 1966; McIlvane, 1972; Miller & Befus, 1968; Pierce, Carkhuff, & Berenson, 1967; Ward, Kagan, & Krathwohl, 1972; Whitley & Jakubowski, 1979). The coached clients received payment for participating in this study.

Supervisors. The supervisors consisted of four male and one female counseling faculty members. Each of these individuals supervised one or more of the counselor trainees who participated in the study.

Instruments

Counselor Rating Form. The CRF was developed by Barak and LaCrosse (1975) in order to measure the dimensions of perceived counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. Research concerning these social influence variables

indicated that the CRF can distinguish among counselors as well as within an individual counselor across all the three dimensions (Barak & Dell, 1977; Barak & LaCrosse, 1977; Kerr & Dell, 1976; LaCrosse & Barak, 1976).

The CRF consists of 36 seven-point bipolar items, and uses a semantic differential format. Each dimension of perceived counselor behavior is measured by 12 items. The range of scores for each dimension is from 12 to 84. Research has indicated that the CRF is reliable (LaCrosse & Barak, 1976) and is a valid instrument for assessing perceptions of counselor trainee behavior from multiple sources (Barak & LaCrosse, 1977).

Counseling Evaluation Inventory. The CEI was developed by Linden, Stone, and Shertzer (1965) as a measure of client satisfaction. It consists of 21 items and utilizes a 5-point Likert-type scale. Congruent and discriminate validity has been established as well as test-retest reliability (Linden et al., 1965). Haase and Miller (1968) found the CEI to contain high face validity. Other studies have demonstrated significant positive correlations between CEI scores and indices of counselor trainee effectiveness (Brown & Cannaday, 1969; Johnson, Shertzer, Linden, & Stone, 1967; McIlvane, 1972; Rickabaugh, Heaps, & Finley, 1972).

Procedure

Prepracticum supervisors (advanced masters and doctoral level counseling students, N = 5) assessed the performance of the counselor trainees (N = 17) with the CRF at the end of prepracticum training. This data was used in the follow-up portion of this study. Neither the supervisors nor the trainees were aware of the social influence variables assessed by the CRF.

Nine months after this initial assessment, the same trainees (N = 17) conducted two 20-minute interviews, one with a female coached client and

one with a male coached client. Nine trainees interviewed the male client first and eight interviewed the female client first. The trainees were not aware that the clients were actors. They were instructed to be as helpful as possible for a period of 20 minutes. Both the coached clients and trainees were informed that the interviews were being videotaped although they did not know for what purpose.

Client roles were adapted from case examples in a counseling textbook (Morse & Watson, 1977). An attempt was made to present two diverse cases to trainees so that an adequate sampling of counselor interventions was possible.

The coached clients were instructed to present their problem to each counselor trainee in the same manner. They were then told that after their problem presentation, they were to behave as if they were truly the client. Thus, an attempt was made to standardize only the initial portion of the interview.

At the end of each interview, the coached client and counselor trainee completed the CRF in separate rooms. Clients also filled out the CBI during this time. Each form was coded so that the three rating sources could be identified for each interview.

Each faculty supervisor was randomly assigned to view the videotaped sessions of particular trainees. The supervisors were given the assigned videotapes and were instructed to complete the CRF after viewing each session. Three supervisors rated three trainees each while two supervisors rated four trainees each.

At the end of each interview, supervisors and trainees were asked to write their perceptions of the coached client's problem as they initially presented it. This was designed as a validation check on the consistency

of problem presentations across all the interviews.

Data Analysis

The use of parametric statistical tests in this study was thought to be contraindicated, due to the probable violations of the normal distribution and equal variance assumptions (Siegel, 1956). The Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks test (one-tailed) was used to analyze differences in supervisor CRF scores made during trainees' prepracticum course and when this study was conducted. Comparisons of client, counselor trainee, and supervisor CRF scores were tested by Spearman-Rho correlation coefficients, as were client CEI and CRF scores. All CRF and CEI ratings were based on the respective mean scores across two interviews for each trainee.

RESULTS

The coached clients appeared to present their problems consistently across all the interviews. This was indicated by the similarity of supervisor and trainee perceptions of the client's presenting problems. The female client's problem was perceived as intended by 100% of the supervisors and 94% of the trainees. The male client's problem was perceived as intended by 94% of the supervisors and 100% of the trainees.

Table 1 presents the means and standard deviations of supervisor CRF ratings made during trainees' prepracticum and internship experiences. Inspection of Table 1 reveals that trainees' scores decreased somewhat over time. One-tailed Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Tests were applied on the pre- and post-scores for each dimension of the CRF and the total score. Results indicated that for all four tests, the T-values were in the opposite direction of that predicted and were therefore nonsignificant ($p > .05$).

Table 2 presents the means and standard deviations of CRF ratings made by clients, trainees, and supervisors. Spearman-Rho correlation

coefficients between the three rating sources for each dimension are presented in Table 3. All of these correlations were nonsignificant ($p > .05$).

The Spearman-Rho correlation coefficients between client CEI ratings and CRF ratings were as follows: expertness, $r = .595$ ($p < .05$); attractiveness, $r = .873$ ($p < .05$); trustworthiness, $r = .868$, total CRF Score, $r = .902$ ($p < .05$).

DISCUSSION

The follow-up data failed to indicate that counselor trainee expertness, attractiveness, trustworthiness, and social influence variables as a whole, as perceived by supervisors, increased significantly from the prepracticum to internship stage of training. Several plausible explanations for these outcomes may be postulated.

It is possible that the trainees did not convey the social influence variables to a greater degree during their internships compared to their prepracticum training. If supervisor perceptions of these dimensions are assumed to be one indicator of trainee's effectiveness as counselors, then these results have serious implications for counselor training. Further research is needed to substantiate this possibility. Nonetheless, the results coincide with studies cited previously which failed to demonstrate an increase in counselor trainee variables or skills over time.

Another explanation for these results may have been due to a possible shortcoming of the CRF. There may have been a "ceiling effect" on the scale, in which case subjects who were rated highly during prepracticum had little opportunity to increase those ratings 9 months later.

The use of a different set of supervisors as raters during each assessment may have accounted for these results. However, this possibility seems slight in light of previous research which indicated substantial agreement among supervisor perceptions of counselor trainee behavior (Barak

& LaCrosse, 1977).

It appears that the social influence variables are easier to display during the early stages of training. The internship stage may represent a period of consolidation, as trainees begin to apply their prepracticum learnings to in vivo counseling cases. Perhaps CRF scores reach a plateau after prepracticum and do not rise significantly until the end of students' formal training or later. The social influence variables may also be easier to convey when trainees are aware they are performing in an analogue interview (i.e., during prepracticum) compared to one in which they believed they were counseling real clients (i.e., the latter assessment in this study).

The data from analyses of client, trainee, and supervisor CRF ratings revealed no significant relationship among them for all CRF dimensions. These findings contradict those of Barak and LaCrosse (1977) and Trotzer (1976), but do agree with other research demonstrating disagreement among client, counselor, and supervisor perceptions of counselor behavior (Borman & Ramirez, 1975, Brams, 1971; Borwn & Cannaday, 1969; Horenstein, Houston, & Holmes, 1973; LaCrosse, 1977).

The mean ratings among the three rating sources (see Table 2) coincided with the pattern in the Barak and LaCrosse (1977) study. However, examination of the raw data from the present study indicated that the three rating sources differed appreciably from each other for many trainees. For example, several trainees rated themselves between 65 and 72 on three dimensions, whereas the client ratings ranged from 70 to 82 and the supervisor ratings were from 24 to 57. Conversely, several trainees who rated themselves between 58 and 65 on three dimensions received substantially higher ratings from their clients (65 to 83) and moderate ratings from the supervisors (55 to 66). Despite the apparent similarity in mean ratings between

trainees and clients (especially on attractiveness and trustworthiness), there was considerable disagreement between them when one examines individual cases. These discrepancies no doubt contributed to the low correlations among the rating sources (see Table 2).

The group results reflect differential judgemental criteria among clients, trainees, and supervisors. What may have seemed very expert, attractive, and trustworthy to a beginning counselor or client may have seemed less so to a supervisor who has participated in and observed numerous counseling sessions. Conversely, the clients' lack of previous experience in counseling, compared with trainees and supervisors, could have contributed to their relatively higher ratings as a group. The counselor trainees generally rated themselves higher than supervisors rated them. This may be indicative of students' tendency to rate themselves higher than faculty supervisors in an evaluation situation. The overall mean trainee ratings also indicate that students see themselves as less expert than clients see them (Barak & LaCrosse, 1977).

Taken collectively, the data highlights the need in counselor training for an explicit exchange among trainees, supervisors, and clients. The supervision process could be enhanced by such a three-way interchange. It appears that the CRF could be used as the basis for such discussion.

There was a significant, positive relationship between client perceptions of trainees' social influence and client satisfaction. While the relationship between these variables has not been researched previously, LaCrosse (1977) found similar results between variables on the CRF and those on the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory.

These results lend support to Strong's (1968) contention that social influence pervades many aspects of the counseling process. Expertness,

attractiveness, and trustworthiness appear to be implicit in many, if not all, counselor behaviors which engender client satisfaction. The results also substantiate the concurrent validity of the CRF. Its use as one measure of counselor trainee effectiveness is supported, if client satisfaction is assumed to be a valid criterion.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The results suggest several avenues for further research. Consideration should be given to replicating this study using real clients during the internship assessment. Subsequent studies could compare assessments of counselor trainees at the end of their training with those made during prepracticum and internship. In addition, assessments made at various points throughout a counseling relationship could be incorporated and compared.

To date, scores on the CRF have been correlated with only two measures, the CEI and the BLRI. While these studies suggest a strong relationship between the social influence variables tapped by the other two scales, more research of this type is warranted. The claim that social influence pervades many aspects of the counseling process can then be made with more certainty. Ultimately, the value of the CRF as an evaluation tool rests with the relationship between scores on it and indices of counseling outcome, i.e., client change.

As mentioned previously, the present investigation employed different supervisor raters at different stages of training. While this procedure approximates what occurs in most counselor training programs (i.e., students having different faculty supervisors throughout their training), it also may have confounded the data in the follow-up study. Research should be designed so that all supervisors rate all trainees. Inter-rater reliabilities

could then be calculated to determine if differences between assessments are due more to supervisor judgements or trainee performance. The use of a control group in a follow-up study would control for other confounding variables.

The results of this study strongly suggest a need for exchanges among clients, trainees, and supervisors regarding perceptions of trainee performance. The CRF could be used as a feedback mechanism among these sources. The effects of such interactions on counselor trainee performance, the supervision process, and client change should be explored. Finally, the use of the CRF in other facets of counselor training, evaluation, and supervision appears to be a worthwhile area for future investigations.

REFERENCES

Atkinson, D. R., & Zimmer, J. M. The counselor trainee pertfolio. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1977, 16, 257-262.

Barak, A., & Dell, D. M. Differential perceptions of counselor behavior. Replication and extension. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1977, 24, 288-292.

Barak, A., & LaCrosse, M. B. Multidimensional perceptions of counselor behavior. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22, 471-476.

Barak, A. & LaCrosse, M. B. Comparative perceptions of practicum counselor behavior. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1977, 16, 202-208.

Bath, K. E. & Calhoun, R. O. The effects of professional counselor training on empathy: Continued cause for concern. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1977, 17, 98-106.

Borman, C. A., & Ramirez, C. Evaluating counseling practicum students. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1975, 15, 48-54.

Brammer, L. M. Who can be a helper? Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1977, 55, 303-308.

Brams, J. M. Counselor characteristics and effective communication in counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1961, 8, 25-30.

Brown, D., & Cannaday, M. Counselor, counselee, and supervisor ratings of counselor effectiveness. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1969, 8, 113-118.

Butler, E. R., & Hansen, J. C. Facilitative training: Acquisition, retention, and modes of assessment. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1973, 20, 60-65.

Canada, R. M., & Lynch, M. L. Systems techniques applied to teaching listening skills. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1975, 15, 40-47.

Carkhuff, R. R. A nontraditional assessment of graduate education in the helping professions. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1968, 7, 252-261.

Collingwood, T. Retention and retraining of interpersonal communication skills. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1971, 27, 294-296.

Dell, D. M. Counselor power base, influence attempt, and behavior change in counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1973, 20, 399-405.

Dell, D. M., & Schmidt, L. D. Behavioral cues to counselor expertness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1976, 23, 197-201.

Garfield, S. L., Prager, R. A., & Bergin, A. E. Evaluation of outcome in psychotherapy. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1971, 37, 307-313.

Gormally, J., & Hill, C. E. Guidlines for research on Carkhuff's training period. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1974, 21, 539-547.

Guttman, M., & Haase, R. Generalization of microcounseling skills from training period to actual counseling setting. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1972, 12, 98-108.

Haase, R. F., Dimattia, D. & Guttman, M. A. J. Training of support personnel in three human relations skills: A systematic one-year follow-up. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1972, 11, 194-499.

Haase, R. F., & Miller, C. D. Comparison of factor analytic studies of the Counseling Evaluation Inventory. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 363-367.

Heller, K., Myers, R. A. & Kline, L. V. Interviewer behavior as a function of standardized client roles. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1963, 26, 117-122.

Horenstein, D., Houston, B. K. & Holmes, D. S. Clients', therapists', and judges' evaluations of psychotherapy. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1973, 20, 149-153.

Hovland, C. I., Janis, I. L., & Kelly, H. H. Communication and Persuasion. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1953.

Hovland, C. I., & Weiss, W. The influence of source credibility on communication effectiveness. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1951, 15, 635-650.

Johnson, D., Shertzer, B., Linden, J. E., Stone, S. C. The relationship of counselor candidate characteristics and counseling effectiveness. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1967, 6, 297-304.

Kelly, H. H. Attribution theory in social psychology. In D. Levine (Ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation (Vol. 15). Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1967.

Kelz, J. W. The development and evaluation of a measure of counselor effectiveness. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1966, 44, 511-516.

Kennedy, M. S. L. The effect of persuasibility of the clients' self-esteem his or her sex, and sex of the counselor (Doctoral dissertation, McGill University, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 36, 6476A-6477A.

Kerr, B. A. & Dell, D. M. Perceived interviewer expertness and attractiveness: Effects of interviewer behavior and attire and interview setting. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1976, 23, 553-556.

Kiesler, D. J. Basic methodoligc issues implicit in psychotherapy process research. American Journal of Psychotherapy, 1966, 20, 135-155.

LaCrosse, M. B. Comparative perceptions of counselor behavior: A replication and extension. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1977, 24, 464-471.

LaCrosse, M. B. & Barak, A. Differential perceptions of counselor behavior. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1976, 23, 170-172.

Linden, J. D., Stone, S. C., & Shertzer, B. Development and evaluation of an inventory for rating counseling. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1965, 44, 267-276.

Mahon, B. R. & Altmann, H. A. Skill training: Cautions and recommendations. Counseling Education and Supervision, 1977, 17, 42-50.

Matarazzo, R. G. Research on the teaching and learning of psychotherapeutic skills. In S. E. Bergin & S. L. Garfield (Eds.) Handbook of Psychotherapy and Behavior Change. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1971.

McCarthy, P. R., Danish, S. J., & D'Augelli, A. R. A follow-up evaluation of helping skills training. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1977, 17, 29-35.

McIlvane, J. T. Coached clients as raters of counseling effectiveness. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1972, 11, 123-129.

Miller, L. L., & Befus, R. Paid clients in counselor education: An experiment. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1968, 8, 84-86.

Moore, M. Counselor training: Meeting new demands. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1977, 55, 359-363.

Morse, S. J., & Watson, R. I., Jr. (Eds.) Psychotherapies: A comparative Casebook. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1977.

Patton, M. J. Attraction, discrepancy, and responses to psychological treatment. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1969, 16, 317-324.

Pierce, R., Carkhuff, R. R. & Berenson, B. G. The differential effects of high and low functioning counselors upon counselors in training. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1967, 23, 212-215.

Resnikoff, A. Critique of the Human Resource Development model from the viewpoint of rigor. The Counseling Psychologist, 1972, 3, 46-61.

Rickabaugh, K., Heaps, R. A. & Finley, R. Counselor comfort, counseling climate, and client satisfaction: Client ratings and academic improvement. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1972, 11, 219-223.

Schmidt, L. D. & Strong, S. R. Attractiveness and influence in counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1971, 18, 348-351.

Schopler, J. Social power. In L Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology (Vol. 2) New York: Academic Press, 1965.

Seaman, E. H., & Wurtz, R. E. Evaluating the practicum: Whither or wither? Counselor Education and Supervision, 1968, 7, 282-285.

Siegel, S. Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.

Slaney, R. B. Perceptions of alternative roles for the facilitative conditions. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1977, 24, 169-172.

Spiegel, S. B. Expertness, similarity, and perceived counselor competence. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1976, 23, 436-441.

Spooner, S. E. & Stone, S. C. Maintenance of specific counseling skills over time. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1977, 24, 66-71.

Strong, S. R. Counseling: An interpersonal influence process. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 215-224.

Strong, S. R. Causal attribution in counseling and psychotherapy. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17, 388-399.

Strong, S. R., & Dixon, D. N. Expertness, attractiveness, and influence in counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1971, 18, 562-570.

Sweeney, T. J. Trends that will influence counselor preparation in the 1980's. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1979, 18, 181-189.

Thorensen, C. E. Relevance and research in counseling. Review of Educational Research, 1969, 39, 264-282.

Tinsley, H. E. A., & Tinsley, D. J. Relationship between scores on the Omnibus Personality Inventory and counselor trainee effectiveness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1977, 24, 522-526.

Tretzer, J. P. Perceptions of counselor performance: A comparative study. Counselor Education And Supervision, 1976, 16, 126-134.

Ward, G. R., Kagan, N. & Krathwohl, D. R. An attempt to measure and facilitate counselor effectiveness. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1972, 11, 179-186.

Whitley, J. M. Counselor education. Review of Educational Research, 1969, 39, 173-187.

Whitley, J. M., & Jakubowski, P. A. The coached client as a research and training resource in counseling. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1969, 9, 19-29.

TABLE 1

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND WILCOXON T-VALUES OF SUPERVISOR CRF RATINGS DURING PREPRACTICUM AND INTERNSHIP

Dimension	Prepracticum Ratings	Internship Ratings	T-Value [A]
Expertness			
M	58.2	52.7	-60
SD	14.9	15.3	
Attractiveness			
M	59.4	56.6	-64
SD	10.9	6.3	
Trustworthiness			
M	62.8	61.3	-66.5
SD	10.5	7.2	
Social Influence Variables [B]			
M	180.5	171.1	-61
SD	33.4	23.7	

A. One-tailed tests predicted positive T-valves.

B. Total score on CRF.

TABLE 2

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF CRF DIMENSIONS

BY RATING SOURCE

Dimension	Rating Source		
	Client	Trainee	Supervisor
Expertness			
M	74.2	65.7	52.7
SD	5.8	4.7	15.3
Attractiveness			
M	71.6	70.2	56.6
SD	6.9	5.5	6.3
Trustworthiness			
M	76.7	74.8	61.8
SD	5.4	6.7	7.2
Social Influence Variables [A]			
M	222.6	210.7	171.1
SD	16.9	15.2	23.7

A. Total Score on CRF

TABLE 3

SPEARMAN-RHO CORRELATIONS AMONG CLIENTS, TRAINEES, AND SUPERVISORS ON THE CRF DIMENSIONS

Dimension	Client-Trainee r	Client-Supervisor r	Supervisor-Trainee
Expertness	.157	.129	.155
Attractiveness	.031	-.206	-.224
Trustworthiness	-.219	-.020	-.010
Social Influence Variables[A]	-.111	-.134	-.262

A. Total Score on CRF.